

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 SHEILA ANN DELMONTE-WRIGHT,  
11 Plaintiff(s),  
12 v.  
13 GEICO CASUALTY COMPANY,  
14 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:19-cv-00921-APG-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 30]

15 Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion for a protective order regarding its  
16 upcoming Rule 30(b)(6) deposition scheduled for November 19, 2019. Docket No. 30.<sup>1</sup> The Court  
17 ordered that any response opposing that motion had to be filed by November 12, 2019. Docket  
18 No. 22 at 4. No response was filed. Accordingly, the motion for protective order with respect to  
19 the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition is hereby **GRANTED** as unopposed. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d).<sup>2</sup>

20  
21 <sup>1</sup> Defendant's papers are at times framed as a motion to "quash" a subpoena pursuant to  
22 Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See, e.g.*, Mot. at 3-4. Defendant is a party to  
23 this litigation and its corporate designee for the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition will be testifying on  
24 behalf of Defendant. *See, e.g., Fadem v. Am. States Preferred Ins. Co.*, 2014 WL 202176, at \*3  
(D. Nev. Jan. 16, 2014). As such, the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition at issue is a party deposition. The  
provisions of Rule 45, which govern nonparty discovery, are inapplicable.

25 <sup>2</sup> Whether the instant motion is timely is a close question for the reasons discussed  
26 previously. *See* Docket No. 22 at 3 n.4. The Court declined to resolve that issue previously and,  
27 instead, ordered Defendant to include argument in its renewed motion as to why the motion should  
28 be considered timely. *Id.* at 4. Defendant's renewed motion does not include any such argument.  
Courts retain the discretion to address *sua sponte* the timeliness of a discovery motion. *See, e.g.,*  
*Garcia v. Service Employees Int'l Union*, \_\_\_ F.R.D. \_\_\_, 2019 WL 3814721, at \*2 n.2 (D. Nev.  
Aug. 13, 2019). Courts are not required to exercise that discretion, however. Given that the instant  
motion for protective order here is unopposed, the Court declines to reach the issue of timeliness.

1 Moreover, the Court will issue as unopposed the proposed order regarding the treatment of  
2 confidential material, as submitted in conjunction with the motion for protective order. *See* Docket  
3 No. 30-1.

4 The Court **CAUTIONS** the attorneys for both parties that their conduct in presenting  
5 discovery disputes in this case has fallen well below the Court's expectations. Counsel are  
6 expected to act in a more competent manner moving forward.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: November 13, 2019

9  
10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Nancy J. Koppe  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28